Vol. IX, No. 13 HUMAN EVENTS March 26, 1952

IS THERE A "JEWISH VOTE"?

By Alfred M. Lilienthal

THE FAILURE of our government to evolve a definite United States program for the Middle East and stick to it has jeopardized our position in this area. It has opened up the front door so wide to Communism that at this moment the chances of putting a halt to Soviet gains in Arab land are slim indeed.

In 1948 the United States was facing the problem of whether or not it should implement a delicate international decision. Following a long and raging controversy, the United Nations had recommended the partition of the British mandate of Palestine. The international organization had no means of carrying out this "recommendation".

The American politician quickly cast the die. This was a Presidential election year. The National Democratic Committee coffers had to be filled. The Chairman informed the President that many large contributors of Jewish faith were holding up their gifts waiting to see what the Administration was going to do about Zionist aspirations.

The political strategists did not have to remind the White House that the so-called Jewish vote with its strength in the large states of New York, Illinois, California and Pennsylvania was important for the re-election of a Democratic Administration. This had been impressed upon the President by Zionist leaders.

On June 23 President Truman ordered the State Department to give *de facto* recognition to the State of Israel and to announce the appointment of James G. McDonald as Minister to the new State. Under Secretary of State Lovett questioned the choice of McDonald "because of his close identification with the Zionists". He was told by Clark Clifford, the administrative assistant, that the "President did not want any discussion of the matter but only action" as he directed. The United States was the first nation to take this step.

This story, and the complete callousness with which considerations of international policy were subordinated to the whims of national politics, was related in detail in the *Forrestal Diaries*. The late Secretary of Defense had labored alone and futilely to take the Palestine issue out of domestic politics.

In the four intervening years, Zionist leaders have carried on their activities as if there were not so much an Israel State as a world-wide Jewish nation in which co-

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religionists everywhere are associated. It is now apparent that the question of dual loyalties is a real one and not a frightening bugaboo. A continuous propaganda campaign of mammoth proportions has been conducted to win governmental grants-in-aid for Israel, to sell Israel bonds and to raise funds for the United Jewish Appeal. The emphasis in these drives is to foist a responsibility to, and political support of, Israel.

In a letter dated January 11, 1951, opening the Israel Bond Sale, former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., as Chairman of the Board of the American Financial and Development Corporation For Israel, declared it to be "a matter of the utmost American patriotism to see to it that the Israel Government Bond issue is a success".

Sixteen Zionist organizations, in a joint public proclamation launching the 1952 Drive for $151,000,000, demanded support because "of the unique and irreplaceable responsibility to take care of the resettlement and rehabilitation of the record influx of immigrants". The tenor of this approach has been maintained in full-page newspaper advertisements.

Political action is advocated in bulletins distributed to the Zionist membership. For example, the members in Manhattan are warned "that only an alert and militant Zionist Organization can swing American public opinion to come to Israel's aid and exert pressure on our Administration of the kind which proved successful in 1947 and 1948 and without which the State would not have come into being". This message continues to say: "We also recognize the fact that every Jew the world over will see his status enhanced or reduced by what Israel accomplishes."

NO WONDER that even the most tolerant person of good will must sincerely ask: "What gives? Are the Jews a nationality or a religion?" To intensify the emotional pressures, a virtual air lift has been operating to bring Cabinet and other important Governmental officials from the new State to this country. At times it might have been easier to obtain a Cabinet quorum in New York or in Washington than in Tel Aviv.

Nor should it be overlooked that every political party in Israel has its own counterpart political group in this country, each beating his own drum. There is intense bitter rivalry amongst these shades of opinion, but they all share in the common desire to dictate policy for the new offspring. This is one of the reasons why issues, which certainly ought to be fought out only in Israel, are sometimes dragged into the American scene. The press in this country, for example, has carried much on the subject on whether Israel should negotiate with Bonn for reparations due to murdered Jews, even to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point of publishing letters to the editor on the pros and cons of an *Israeli plebiscite* to settle the question.

An additional contribution to the "tale of two countries" has been the intemperate appeals by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion to American Jewry to emigrate to Israel. He has rebuked American Zionists for advising others to go while refraining from settling themselves in Israel in greater numbers. To close observers of Jewish nationalism there was nothing remarkable in what the leading political figure of Israel has said save the fact that he had expressed it openly. This basic dogma of the "ingathering of the exiles" has been constantly reiterated in Party councils and has been set forth in all published Zionist doctrinaire literature since the publication of Theodore Herzl's book.

THE TOTAL IMPRESSION conveyed by these activities has prompted American political leaders to further the goals of Jewish nationalism. This, they were led to believe, would be an effective method of catching a large bloc vote. Harry Truman has furthered his reputation of going one better in the wrong direction. The President will personally address the Jewish National Fund, which is tied in with the construction and development of Israel and which has no connection whatever with anything American.

What all these "bleeding hearts" forget is that Israel foreign policy quite properly is based upon a pursuit of her own interests, which may or may not coincide with those of the United States. The Israel Foreign Office has walked a tight rope, maintaining the strictest neutrality between East and West, always cognizant of the presence of the Red power not too distant from her shores.

The Communist Party is a real factor in Israel, not so much through its own strength but through other allies in the National Legislature (Knesset), such as the Mapam Party, which is Soviet-orientated. Only recently steps were taken to put the United States on an equal footing with the Soviet Union in importing books, periodicals and newspapers. For several years the Soviet Embassy has been permitted to finance itself with the proceeds from the sales of Russian books. According to the *New York Times* of March 10th, a survey of book stores in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem brought to light the fact that Russian books were plentiful and cheap, whereas the few English books were unsalable.

Immigration to Israel during the past year was drawn, as it will be in the future, from Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia, not from the democratic West. The developing culture of this State is more likely to be non-Western and semi-Oriental, which could make it an easier prey for the Russians, themselves semi-Oriental.

Israel approaches her problems from a realistic and understandably selfish viewpoint.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THESE ARE FACTORS which ought to stem the emotional blank check which some, in their enthusiasm, would give to the new State. Unfortunately, it is these articulate few who presume to speak in the name of the many. The overwhelming majority of American Jewry, for mixed reasons — fear, inertia, or shortsightedness — are content to remain cowed. Formerly, their silence meant nothing. Now, however, it signifies to the outsider a complete surrender to the idea that religious fealty to Judaism requires political loyalty to Israel.

Some have become aware of this. Arthur Koestler, the renowned writer and a devout Zionist until the creation of Israel, felt that Zionism and Judasim are now one and inseparable, and that he could no longer be a Jew and a loyal British subject. He renounced his religion. Others will, of course, continue the fight to return the Judaic faith to its universalist and non-nationalistic path.

These words are not written to build a case for bigots, who need no facts to support their intolerance. They are written for men of good will of all faiths so that they may understand this problem and act accordingly. All ghetto-thinking and "bloc-vote" tactics, which perpetuate this, should be ended. There is no deliverable "Jewish Vote".

A letter from a sick soldier in the Letterman General Hospital, in San Francisco, is very much in point: "We have other ghettos in America beside Jewish. We have English, Italian, Negro, Portugese, Mexican, Irish and the Japanese and Chinese ghettos, even here in the Oakland area — all seem to be of national origin first and American last. I have never been capable of attacking any man's religion but I have never been able to condone nationalism disguised as religion or religion disguised as nationalism." These ghettos are constantly being kept alive by the politicians in their quest for votes.

If America is to survive, it must grow up from a mere association of national, racial and religious groups into a strong federation able to serve the interests of the country as a whole. This is what public servants must be told in this election year. Unless they act on the principle of "No Ghettos for America", the United States cannot expect to become united at home nor strong enough to resist tyranny abroad.

An application of this basic principle to foreign relations would be far-reaching and might still save the Middle East. It would of necessity abruptly break up the combine of Zionist leaders and the politicians, but would restore sanity in a vital area. What is required is a policy which is wholly in the national interest — which is neither pro-Israel nor pro-Arab, but simply pro-American.

Alfred M. Lilienthal, formerly of the Department of State, has written extensively on Near East and Zionist problems for *HUMAN EVENTS, Reader's Digest, American Mercury* and other publications.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 13 — Wednesday, March 26, 1952 — Washington, D. C.

Action in the Middle West: A primary in Wisconsin and a write-in campaign for Taft in the Nebraska primary on April 1st — these are two big events which Washington observers expect will show strong reaction against both the Truman Administration and General Eisenhower.

The latter are bracketed together because of their agreement that Universal Military Training (UMT) must be put over in this session of Congress. Eisenhower is strongly for Universal Military Training. Taft and most Middle West Republicans oppose UMT.

It is believed that the recent defeat of this measure in the House of Representatives indicates that Middle Westerners, both rural and urban, feel strongly against it. The guess is that this attitude will be reflected in a big Taft vote in both Wisconsin and Nebraska.

The reason the issue is still hot is that, despite the defeat of UMT in the House, the Truman Administration has publicly announced that it will try again to push it over this session. It is believed they will make an attempt to get the Senate to pass the bill before May 1. Taft is on record against the measure and it is anticipated that he will wage a big fight against Universal Military Training in the Upper Chamber.

Reports in the past twenty-four hours from Nebraska and Wisconsin suggest that voters are aware of this lineup — Eisenhower for UMT, Taft dead against it. Presumably, they will flock to the polls to vote for Taft.

But, if they do not so vote, the Administration will take it as a sign that opposition to UMT is crumbling and that therefore the time is ripe to put over the measure, before the 1st of May at the latest. Should the Democrats succeed, the machinery to draft the boys will soon follow.

In Washington, it is emphasized that the Middle Western sentiment against UMT can by no means be described as "isolationism" or "pacifism". Leaders from the corn belt have shown their distrust of a bill containing so many features apparently designed to regiment American youth in the customary totalitarian manner. But, they also are strongly convinced that the measure would detract from rather than add to our military strength.

It is well known here that General MacArthur is opposed to UMT, that he sees in it a waste of manpower and economic resources. Also, General MacArthur's former aide, General Bonner Fellers (Rtd.), has spoken out against UMT. It is an open secret here that Fellers enjoys great influence on Senator Taft's military thinking. Recent Taft speeches reflect these views.

International Bankers Back Ike: George Sokolsky, widely-known columnist and radio commentator, launched a strong attack on the Wall Street supporters of General Eisenhower in a broadcast last Sunday (ABC network, 10:30 p.m., March 23). Sokolsky said:

"The Wall Street supporters of General Eisenhower were jubilant [about Taft's withdrawal from New Jersey]. Such moneymen as George Whitney, Clarence Dillon, Harold Talbott, John Hay Whitney and Winthrop Aldrich — Big Bankers — who are supporting Eisenhower and masterminding his campaign, operate as businessmen do in ruthless competition, forgetting that the primary is a prelude to a general election and that nothing should be done in the primaries which will have the effect of a cumulative spite vote in the General Election. The real danger now is that so much hard feeling is developing in

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Republican Party by such tricks as Governor Driscoll used, that many Republicans will stay away from the polls in anger."

It should be explained that Governor Driscoll of New Jersey at first promised to stay neutral and keep the State GOP machine out of the primary. Last week he broke his promise, came out for Ike; and Taft angrily withdrew from the primary. Sokolsky intimates that the Wall Streeters had a hand in the New Jersey switch to Eisenhower.

Sokolsky mentioned General MacArthur: "He supports Taft; he opposes Eisenhower; he does not preclude his own candidacy. . . . The international bankers can exercise no influence on General MacArthur. My estimate of his attitude toward them is that he despises the use of money to corrupt the electoral processes of a free people. . . . The American businessman is probably the ablest in the world. He has learned the techniques of management so that in finance, in production and distribution, he is extraordinarily competent, producing astounding results. Undoubtedly there is some element in the training of the businessman that makes him a poor public servant, and a worse politician. In party politics, he is a confusing factor. As the Republican Party traditionally included many businessmen, it has suffered from this more than the Democrats have. They may have produced already the reasons for a Republican defeat."

The Truth About Minnesota: The big money Eisenhower publicity machine and its allies, the Fair Deal columnists, refer in awed tones to "the miracle of Minnesota" — meaning the write-in vote for Eisenhower in that state last week.

This phrase sends political experts here into spasms of cynical laughter. They remind us that political history in recent decades has been marked by literally hundreds of write-ins, none of them "miracles" and most of them well-organized. The biggest one that comes to mind was the McKee-for-Mayor write-in, engineered in New York in 1932 resulting in a vote of 241,000. One remark made is "The Minnesota write-in was about as spontaneous as a Stalin plebiscite."

Contrary to what the Eisenhower press says, there are frequent private assertions here from Ike quarters that the organization used for the putsch was prepared months ago. Certainly, its "telephone the voter" technique was a well-considered imitation of a similar technique used (by the same New York interests) in the Willkie "blitz" of 1940.

Furthermore, the Eisenhower drive had no organized opposition in this field. The Taft organization publicly opposed a write-in for its adherents. Despite this, popular feeling for the Ohioan spontaneously produced a 24,000 vote write-in at the polls. Taft people now say that if they had organized a write-in vote, they could have delivered 100,000 votes easily.

Despite a widely disseminated impression, the Eisenhower vote was directed not against Taft, but against Stassen who was the big candidate on the ballot. Since the former Governor has been living and working in Pennsylvania, there has arisen a great deal of opposition to his political candidacy; to many in his former state of Minnesota, he is an "absentee landlord".

Finally, the Big Secret — as we learn from our sources in the Twin Cities — was the turn-out of left-wingers for Ike. Within the Ike organization in Minnesota, we understand, discussion of this matter is strongly discouraged, with many a "sh-sh". Now, all politicians know well the traditional strength of the left-wing Farmer Labor element in Minnesota. Therefore it is interesting to note that the pro-Eisenhower Minneapolis *Star* lifted the hem of the curtain on March 19 when it said: "The slim 32,000 vote showing of the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer Labor voters gave support to suspicion that they helped boost Ike's edge." The "edge", according to political estimates we have received, may have run to 50,000 write-ins, or about half the Ike vote.

The Left Likes Ike: Numerous members of Congress — we found on a visit to Capitol Hill the other day — find it not at all surprising that left-wingers and Democrats are an important part of the Eisen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hower-for-President movement. The Hill has not forgotten a very illuminating series of remarks in the House by Congressman Busbey (R., Ill.) on February 20. Busbey said:

"Apparently Eisenhower's band wagon is being organized by people with hefty investments in the Democratic Party. The Eisenhower 'band wagon committee' is sprinkled with names closely associated with the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations." Among them Busbey named Arthur Loew, who together with his associates, contributed the grand total of $31,500 to the Democratic National Committee in 1949 and 1950. Busbey went on:

"Another key Eisenhower man, William Zeckendorf, who also liked Ike well enough to be on his band wagon committee, liked the Democratic National Committee in 1949 and 1950 well enough to invest $4,000 in their political program."

The Illinois Congressman also mentioned Quentin Reynolds, who has thrown his support to Ike and who once figured on an "anti-fascist" committee; Busbey remarked that "the Attorney General's list shows that outfit to be subversive and Communist". Moss Hart and Oscar Hammerstein, also on the Ike band wagon, are names which appeared on the lists of interesting organizations mentioned in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Miss Faye Emerson, former wife of Elliott Roosevelt, also helps Ike's band wagon roll. The record shows that she was a member of the left-wing PCA, which threw its support to Henry Wallace's bid for Presidency in 1948.

Alliances between big banking interests, seeking quick profits, and left-wingers are an old story, dating from the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. The left-wingers, of course, have no inhibitions about such alliances, since they feel — with some justification — that they will ultimately win.

Publicity Gag: New talent has been added to the well-financed publicity battalion at Ike headquarters, and new phrase-making is under way.

The latest gag generated by these brains and sent over to Ike is being tried out among the other 11 nations of NATO. The title so bestowed on Ike is "Mr. American". This is designed to contrast with the title which was given to Taft, "Mr. Republican".

How the gag will "take" on this side of the Atlantic is problematical. It is pointed out that already Ike is being dubbed "Mr. One-Twelfth American". This is a reference to his remarks about submerging our sovereignty in the 12-nation North Atlantic alliance. On July 27, 1951, the *U. S. News* said about Ike:

"He takes seriously the promise to act only one-twelfth American and one-twelfth British, French, Belgian, etc. On a mantel piece in his office stands a constant reminder of this pledge — miniature flags of the 12 Allies lining up like soldiers in a row."

MacArthur: Fair Deal columnists are busy reporting rifts between MacArthur and Taft and playing up presumed political ambitions of the General. These, of course, are recognizably not reports, but political fabrications put out in an effort to divide the anti-Eisenhower Republicans.

However, those close to the General reiterate, as they have for a long time, that MacArthur stands ready to take the political stump if Taft seems to need it. It is believed that MacArthur will speak more frequently from now on. Also, it is privately said that the General — if he deems the situation necessary — will select Oregon, with its primary scheduled for May 15, as his first real political battle-ground.

Meanwhile, his figure looms of increasing importance in the South, particularly since last Saturday when he addressed the state legislature in Jackson, Miss. His advocacy of a political philosophy which Southerners quickly recognized as "states rights" fed the enthusiasm of his listeners. Jackson is the city which witnessed the birth of the Dixiecrat movement in 1948.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We know of one prominent Southern political leader, now on record for Ike, who privately says he may switch to MacArthur if the latter indicates he wants the Presidency. We believe there are others of like view.

Russell: The big news about Candidate Russell of Georgia in the past few days was his startling public tribute to General MacArthur. As reported by the Washington Sunday *Star* (a paper favorable to Eisenhower) on March 23, Senator Russell suggested that "he might give a top military post to General MacArthur if elected President".

The Georgia Senator, contender now for the Democratic nomination, referred to MacArthur as a "great military genius" and said, if he became President, he "would wish to utilize the military knowledge and capacity of General MacArthur in defending the United States". This is particularly interesting because Russell is the Democratic Chairman of the powerful Senate Armed Services Committee and as such presided over the hearings of the MacArthur investigation last year.

Russell in his broadcast made clear that he agreed with MacArthur's plan to bomb the Red China mainland — one of the reasons why Truman dismissed the General. It is especially remarked that Russell mentioned MacArthur instead of Eisenhower (who stands for a world strategy quite the opposite of that of MacArthur). Russell knows Southern sentiment, as few politicians do, and would hardly have spoken carelessly. It is a fair conclusion that Russell estimates that Southern sentiment is at least as strong for MacArthur as it has seemed to be for Eisenhower.

Germany: Dean Acheson's much ballyhooed "success" at the recent Lisbon Conference has suffered a severe blow, according to talk among Washington's diplomatic colony. The blow was Russia's offer on March 10 to neutralize Germany. At first played down by the State Department as "old stuff", the Soviet offer was not treated so lightly by the Western European countries whom Acheson claims to have united against Russia in the Lisbon meeting.

As a result of the Soviet offer, "neutralism" has received a new impetus in England, France, the Low Countries, Italy and Germany. German Chancellor Adenauer himself conceded that it indicated a "certain progress". Signs from London show that the British Government is taking it seriously. Diplomats say that the Germans cannot help but recognize that the Soviet plan — whether sincere or not — offers them a great deal. Reports multiply that the Red Polish Government is moving nervously, fearing that Moscow might "sell them out" by eventually returning old German territory (given to Poland after the war) to a neutralized Reich. Today, the State Department is reported to be scared. There is no doubt that the Soviet offer is one of immense importance.

The veteran correspondent, Karl von Weigand, confirms this picture in the Hearst papers (March 23) and assigns the blame to our State Department which has shilly-shalleyed with the Germans, granting too little too late and is still doing so. He says: "Germany should have been taken into the West in 1947, as I urged on September 14 of that year. The years have been lost in indecision in dealing with Bonn, and in futile jockeying with Britain and France to the detriment of American national interest and security."

Books: Most refutations of the Keynesian theory are as forbidding as the theory itself; therefore, they remain unread, except by Keynesians, whose business it is to refute the refutations. However, V. Orval Watts, an economist who has taken the trouble to learn how to write, comes up with something different: a presentation and a refutation of Keynesian premises in language that all of us can afford to read. Moreover, the book is complete in 103 pages, and sells for only One Dollar. Published by the Foundation for Social Research, Los Angeles, California.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change in address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED